

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/753,947	SIEGEL, STEPHEN B.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Marianne L. Padgett	1762	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** Amended

(1) Marianne L. Padgett.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Thomas Tolpin.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 18 January 2007

**Time:** ~1:00 p.m.

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

NA

**Claims discussed:**

1 & 13

**Prior art documents discussed:**

NA

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

MARIANNE PADGETT  
PRIMARY EXAMINER



\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Agreed to an Examiner's Amendment, which clarified ambiguous phrasing in the cooling limitation of independent claim 1, corrected inconsistent nomenclature for the claims as amended in claim 13 & further clarified the 10/10/2006 amendment to the specification on page 8.

It was noted that the addition of -- gas -- after "oxygen" may be considered supported by the original specification (p.8) , because the original nomenclature encompassed oxygen gas & the original contradictory phrasing would have led one of ordinary skill in the art when considering the specific given example of carbon dioxide, to such a conclusion, since the example of carbon dioxide clearly contains oxygen, so that the gas being excluded must be oxygen gas, not merely a gas molecule whose components included oxygen & another element, i.e. since hetero molecular compounds such as carbon dioxide were being considered for the heavier-than-air gas, the clearest or most logical intent of the "non-oxygen-containing gas" phrase would have been to exclude oxygen gas. Thus the context of the contradictory and ambiguous phrasing & common chemical knowledge may be considered to provide enablement for the Examiner's amendment to the specification on page 8.